



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/601,004	09/11/2000	Kazuo Toraichi	A-371	4200
802	7590	11/18/2004	EXAMINER	
DELLETT AND WALTERS P. O. BOX 2786 PORTLAND, OR 97208-2786			DO. CHAT C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2124	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/601,004

Applicant(s)

TORAICHI ET AL.

Examiner

Chat C. Do

Art Unit

2124

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 September 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☒ A Notice of Appeal was filed on 25 October 2004. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See below.

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 112 rejections for claims 1-4, 6, 8.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See below.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 6 and 8.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 5 and 7.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Part 2(a): The applicant amended independent claim 1 by inserting the limitation "processing image data" in line 2 and modified data along the claim as image data which raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search prior making a decision.

Part 5(c): First, the interpretation of "local support" by the examiner in previous action is broadly same as the definition cited by the application wherein the examiner assume the function is bandlimited which has zero outside the band and non-zero within the band. Based on the original claim language, the examiner believes Masaru et al. disclose all the limitations cited in the application. Wherein Masaru et al. disclose a two variable data interpolation system (Introduction section lines 16-18 page 1252 and Preliminaries section lines 1-5 page 1252) wherein a value between a plurality of discrete data is interpolated by performing convolution operation (equations 1-6 page 1252) corresponding to the plurality of discrete data positioned at equal intervals in a two-dimensional space (Preliminaries section lines 1-7 page 1252) using a sampling function that can be differentiated finite times and has values of a local support (Figure 1 and left column lines 1-4 page 1253).

*Kakali Chak*  
**KAKALI CHAKI**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**